

REMARKS

This Amendment and Request for Reconsideration is submitted in response to an outstanding Office Action dated May 7, 2004, the shortened statutory period for response set to expire on August 7, 2004. Accordingly, no Extension of time is believed necessary. In the event that the Commissioner determines an extension of time or fee is due, applicants hereby petition for such extension of time, and authorize the Commissioner to charge any required fee to the Milbank deposit account number 13-3250.

I. Status of the Claims

Please amend claims 1, 2, 4, 8-12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 22, and 24-30 as indicated above. Claims 1-30 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 11, 15, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30 are independent claims.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's citation of statutory authority as a basis for claim rejections.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 5-15, 18-22, and 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chihara et al. The Examiner has rejected Claims 3, 4, 13, 14, 16, 17, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Chihara in view of Rager et al.

In the presently claimed inventions, the output device is connected to the information processing device on a user side via a first or local connection, and is connected to the information processing device on a supplier side via a second or network connection. The output device has the following additional functions of receiving a request from the information processing device on the user side via the first or local connection; receiving data according to the above-mentioned request from the information processing device on the supplier side via the second or network connection; and outputting the data received from the information processing

device on the supplier side.

Further, with respect to claims 1, 9, 11, 25, 26, 28 and 29, the information processing device on the supplier side determines a type of device to receive the data and controls the transmission of the data to the output device in response to the determination.

Also, with respect to claims 15, 22, 27 and 30, the output device sends to the information processing device on the supplier side charge information responding to the output of the data.

In Chihara, only printer 2 is connected to the upper device 3 and the upper device 4 is connected to the upper device 3 via network so as to be able to output the data by the printer 2. More specifically, in Chihara, the printer 2 is merely connected to the upper device 3 via local connection. Therefore, Chihara fails to disclose or suggest that the output device is connected to the information processing device on the user side via a first or local connection, and further is connected to the information processing device on the supplier side via a second or network connection.

Rager only discloses erasing the encryption key information from the memory when the power supply of the device is turned off.

Accordingly, applicant submits that neither Chihara nor Rager individually or in combination disclose or suggest the presently claimed inventions, and withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

III. Request for Reconsideration

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance is requested. If a conference would assist in placing this application in better condition for allowance, the undersigned would appreciate a telephone call at the number indicated.

Respectfully submitted,
Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP



Chris L. Holm
Reg. No.: 39,227

August 9, 2004

Milbank Tweed Hadley & McCloy LLP
1 Chase Manhattan Plaza
New York, NY 10005
(212) 530-5000 / (212) 530-5219 (facsimile)